

CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD:

SUBJECT: Boland-Zablocki Amendment Strategy Meeting, 30 June 83

1. Attendees at subject follow-on meeting to the Wednesday meeting attended by the DCI, included Congressmen Jim Wright, Zablocki, Broomfield, Robinson, Young and McCurdy. Chairman Wright attended for the first half hour; the meeting continued for another 30-40 minutes after he left. Other attendees included Ken Dam, Bud McFarlane, Powell Moore, M.B. Oglèsby (Dep. Asst/President Legislative Affairs), Jack Brady (HFAC Staff Director), and myself.

2. In conversation with Dam before the meeting, I conveyed my instructions from the DCI not to settle on a final version until the return of the President and Secretary of State. Ken noted that the thrust of Chairman Wright's thinking was favorable and if he desired to finalize at this meeting, Ken suggested we ought to think seriously about doing so. The problem was solved when the Chairman announced slippage of the House secret session by about a week (13 to 19 July).

3. Ken noted problems with "the Wright text" (Tab A: a version submitted by the Chairman to replace the text cabled to the DCI). The bulk of the discussion concerned Page 2, Section 802 (b) (1) and (b) (2). Zablocki agreed with the others that it was not intended that simply an agreement to negotiate would suffice, but more explicit action was required. After fairly extensive semantic debate, it was decided to insert a sentence ensuring provision of an "effective multinational verification" capability and to revamp para (b) into three sub-paragraphs.

4. A good bit of the debate, particularly that of Young and McCurdy (Chairman Wright having left) concerned their view that the text should not enumerate too many required conditions or it would never fly. Also, said McCurdy, it would leave the door open for CIA to start up again on the basis, say, of conditions 1-6 being met but not 7, etc. There was discussion of amnesty, of what the San Jose convention includes, how one ensures verification et al.

5. Conclusion: Section 802 (b) would be revised and a new draft circulated.

6. Then there was more spirited discussion of Section 801, including, a question by Ken as to whether/why it was needed at all. He did, however, reflect less concern about this Section than 802. McCurdy, Young, Zablocki and, I think, Broomfield all defended its retention as a deliberate strategy to get a number of others who had voted for the Boland amendment on board. All agreed that Boland would stand firm. Ken Dam said the Administration had real problems with retention of language that inferred a breaching of law. Robinson said that he still hoped some language change was possible. Both he and Dam said they thought "Bill Casey would have problems" with the overthrow language and should have a crack at it. I showed Robinson a suggested language change on that issue (developed by [redacted] and run by [redacted]). Robinson 25X1 liked it; he showed it to Zablocki and told me Zablocki liked it. State apparently did too - they copied it too.

7. Brady was designated as focal point for pulling together a new text. Powell Moore was to get the Executive Branch copies distributed. [Received ca 5:30 p.m. attached Tab B]

8. Nothing was said about another meeting or deadline for response to the latest text.

9. At Tab C are Stan Sporkin's comments.



Executive Director

25X1

CONFIDENTIAL